

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action. New claim 6 has been added by the present amendment.

Claims 2-4 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wolff in view of Iyriboz. Claim 2 recites, “additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data of the image requests is copied from the operative image data server computer to the destination image data server computer, and the destination image data server computer is made to execute the data processing.” The Examiner cites Iyriboz at 13:36-39 and 48-49 as teaching “additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data.” The Examiner cites Iyriboz at 5:43-47 as teaching “of the image requests is copied from the operative image data server computer to the destination image data server computer, and the destination image data server computer is made to execute the data processing.”

Claim 2 requires that the additional information, which includes scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data of the image requests, is copied from the operative image data server computer to the destination image data server computer. Assuming, *arguendo*, that Iyriboz teaches “additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data” at 13:36-39 and 48-49 as asserted by the Examiner, Iyriboz does not teach that said additional information is copied from an operative image data server computer to a destination image data server computer. Iyriboz’s remote operator control 350 and virtual reality viewing application 362 are part of a remote computer 34, which downloads compressed images of “the sequence” (i.e., a sequence of sphere-mappable panoramic views of selected portions of the CT

data along a viewpath) from a server 26. See Fig. 1, Fig. 2C and 13:10-14. The remote operator control 350 and virtual reality viewing application 362 enable a remote viewer to rotate pitch and yaw to selectively view any portion of the spherical image (13:36-38). The remote operator control 350 and virtual reality viewing application 362 also permit the remote viewer to move along the view path, via a path motion processor 394 (13:40-49).

*The remote operator control 350, virtual reality viewing application 362 and path motion processor 394 are all part of the remote computer 34.* No “additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data” is copied from the remote computer to a destination image data server computer. Iyriboz merely teaches that compressed images of “the sequence” are downloaded by the remote computer 34. Iyriboz does not teach or suggest that data with respect to pitch, yaw or movement along the view path entered through the remote operator control 350 are transmitted anywhere or are used anywhere other than locally at the remote computer 34. Therefore, the teachings cited by the Examiner cannot teach that additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data of the image requests, is copied from the operative image data server computer to the destination image data server computer, as asserted by the Examiner.

Furthermore, claim 2 requires that data processing executed by the destination image data server computer *replaces* data processing performed by *the operative image data server computer*. In Iyriboz, “the sequence” data is generated via a human operator 24 using a sequence generating computer 22 (5:40-41). The sequence data is transferred from the sequence generating computer 22 to a server 26. Applicant submits that Iyriboz’s sequence generating computer 22, which the human operator 24 directly operates in generating the sequence, does not teach or suggest an image data server computer, as recited in claim 2. Moreover, Iyriboz’s

server 26 merely parses and compresses the sequence data from the sequence generating computer 22 (12:24-49). In fact, the server 26 is unnecessary and can be completely omitted from the viewing system (12:62-63). Therefore, any data processing executed by Iyriboz's server 26 does not *replace* other data processing, as required by claim 2.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the cited combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 2.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not provided sufficient motivation or a suggestion to combine the references necessary for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A conclusory statement of benefit, such as the one provided by the Examiner in the Office action, is not sufficient to show obviousness. Applicant submits that no motivation is present in the prior art of record that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wolff and Iyriboz as suggested by the Examiner.

For all of the reasons discussed above, claim 2 is allowable over the cited combination of references. Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 2 and, therefore, are also allowable. Claim 6 has been added, which also depends from claim 2.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No.: 10/812,770  
Amdt. Dated: April 13, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: February 9, 2007

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36609.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Brad C. Spencer/ *BCS*  
Brad C. Spencer, Reg. No. 57076

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: April 13, 2007